

### REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 14, 2005. Claims 1 and 3-6 are now pending. Claim 2 and non-elected Claims 7-22 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention, and Claims 4 and 6 have been amended merely as to formal matter. No change in scope is either intended or believed effected by at least the latter changes, which have not been made for purposes relating to patentability. Claim 1 is in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Initially, affirmation of the previous oral election of Group I, Claims 1-6, is hereby made, as required in the Office Action.

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,278,234 (*Ono et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,422,824 (*Lee et al.*).

Independent Claim 1 recites an image display device comprising, in an airtight container, an electron source, an image display member, and a getter. The image display member faces the electron source to receive electrons from the electron source. The getter comprises an evaporating getter and a non-evaporating getter laminated successively on the image display member in the airtight container.

The Office Action relies on *Ono et al.* as teaching "an image display device comprising in an airtight container an electron source (column 6, line 52, and 1 of fig. 1),

an image display member (column 6, lines 55-58, and 4 of fig. 1); and a getter (column 6, line 57, and 9 of fig. 1), the image display member facing the electron source to receive electrons from the electron source (column 6, lines 50-58, and 1, 4, and 5 of fig. 1)."

Nonetheless, the Office Action then concedes that "*Ono et al.* do not disclose the ... image display device wherein the getter is obtained by stacking an evaporating and a non-evaporating getter in an airtight container." Indeed, nothing in that reference would teach or suggest an image display device in which a getter comprises an evaporating getter and a non-evaporating getter laminated successively on an image display member in an airtight container, as set forth in Claim 1.

The Office Action relies on *Lee et al.* for supplying what is missing from *Ono et al.*

*Lee et al.* discloses, as a relation between an evaporative getter and a non-evaporative getter, merely that an evaporative getter is positioned juxtaposed to a non-evaporative getter in a cavity of a device (col. 3, lines 3-6), and arranged in unique positions such that ions emitted by the evaporative getter upon activation substantially shield the non-evaporative getter so that gases emitted by the non-evaporative getter when activated do not affect a state of vacuum in the vacuum display panel (col. 5, lines 30-35).

However, nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Lee et al.*, that would disclose or suggest an image display device in which a getter comprises an evaporating getter and a non-evaporating getter laminated successively on an image display member in an airtight container, as set forth in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly patentable over *Lee et al.* and *Ono et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.


The other claims in this application are each dependent from independent Claim 1 discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons as is that claim. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by

telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank A. DeLucia', is written over a horizontal line.

Frank A. DeLucia  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,476

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 524478v1